UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE

EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : CRIMINAL CASE

:

Plaintiff(s) : Case No. 2:18-cr-00026-JHS-1

2:19-cr-00417-JHS-1

•

v. : Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

: June 3, 2021

JUSTIN DAVID MAY, : Time 10:04 a.m. to 12:12 p.m.

:

Defendant(s) :

.

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOEL H. SLOMSKY UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Michael S. Lowe, Esq.

U.S. Attorney's Office

615 Chestnut Street, Ste. 8136

Philadelphia, PA 19106

For Justin David May: Natasha Taylor-Smith, Esq.

Federal Comm. Def. Off. for EDPA 601 Walnut Street, Ste. 540 West

Philadelphia, PA 19106

Court Recorder: A. J. Follmer

Clerk's Office

U.S. District Court

Transcription Service: Precise Transcripts

45 N. Broad Street Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

Case 2:18-cr-00026-JHS Document 58 Filed 07/15/21 Page 2 of 74

				•			
						2	
	INDEX						
	D	С	RD	RC	FRD	FRC	
WITNESSES FOR DEFENSE: Susan Stanton	29						
Susair Stairtoir	29						

1 (Proceedings started at 10:04 a.m.) 2 JUDGE JOEL H. SLOMSKY: Please be seated. 3 COUNSEL NATASHA TAYLOR-SMITH: Good morning, Your 4 Honor. COUNSEL MICHAEL S. LOWE: Good morning, Your 5 6 Honor. 7 THE COURT: Good morning. Before, before we begin, I just want everybody to know you have to sit at a 8 9 seat with a green checkmark behind you. Okay. Alright, we're on the record. This is the cases of United States 10 versus Justin David May, criminal numbers 18-26 and 19-479 11 12 and representing Mr. May is Natasha Taylor-Smith, welcome. 13 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Good morning. And I note the 15 presence of Mr. May in court. Good morning. 16 JUSTIN DAVID MAY: Good morning, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Good morning and welcome. And the 18 Government is represented by Michael Lowe or Assistant 19 U.S. Attorney. 20 MR. LOWE: Good morning, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Welcome. And seated with you at counsel table is --22 23 SPECIAL AGENT SEAN NORMAN: Special Agent Sean 24 Norman (ph) of the FBI. 25 THE COURT: Welcome. Alright.

MR. LOWE: Your Honor, there was -- I think the Court misspoke on the case number for the 19 case. It's 19-417.

THE COURT: 19-417, yes.

MR. LOWE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. Alright, we're here today for sentencing on the September 6, 2018. Mr. May appeared before me on criminal indictment number 18-26 and entered guilty pleas to counts 1 through 20 and 31 through 45 and the Government will be moving to dismiss after today counts 21 through 30 I believe.

MR. LOWE: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And on July 18, 2019 -- I'm sorry, on September 12, 2019, Mr. May appeared before me again and entered a guilty - an open guilty plea to counts 1 through 22 of criminal indictment number 19-417 and the first indictment I referred to, 18-26, was a guilty plea pursuant to a, a plea agreement that the defendant had with the Government. And before I came to court today, I read the revised Presentence Report dated March 10, 2020 and I read the document number 33 which is the defendant's sentencing - let's see it's not document 33, it's -- well apparently there was, there was a different memoran—different times when the memorandums were filed but I'm looking at document number 51, Counsel, and that's titled

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defendant Sentencing Memorandum and Request for a Variance and I read the attachments carefully that include a letter from David Stanton. I read a letter from, report actually, from Kenneth Weiss, M.D. (ph) that, dated April 27, 2021 which is timely. I read a letter from an Andrew Puddington (ph) and I also read a letter from Susan Stanton (ph), Mr. May's mother, and I also reviewed the, and read the Government's Sentencing Memorandum which is document number 26 in the record. I believe these, the documents, have been filed in both cases, am I correct? MR. LOWE: Yes, Your Honor. MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. I have in front of me also a, an Order of Forfeiture. Apparently, the, the Government is seeking to forfeit at least \$38,036.00 in criminal indictment number 19-417. I don't think there's an objection to that. Is that correct? MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: There is no objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright. So, let me sign that order and we'll make that part of the record. And today is the 3rd day of June. I'm changing the year to 2021. And that order will be made part of the record and completes that.

Now, I realize I referred to another filing in both cases, which is document 33-6 but I, I think that was

supplemented?

MR. LOWE: Your Honor, I'm not sure about that one but there is a, there's another Order of Forfeiture, motion for Order of Forfeiture on proposed order in case number 18-26.

THE COURT: 18-26?

MR. LOWE: I have, if Your Honor would like, I have a copy.

9 THE COURT: Yeah, let me see that. I don't have 10 that in front of me.

MR. LOWE: It's document number 28 on the docket list, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And this seeks forfeiture of an amount up to \$299,587.00 in criminal indictment number 18-26. Is that correct?

MR. LOWE: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I believe, believe there's no objection to that also.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That is correct.

THE COURT: Alright. So, I -- alright, I have read that order, it seems appropriate. I will sign that order. Now, Ms. Taylor-Smith, again, I, I just want to make sure I put on the record everything I've considered. I'm not sure what 33-6 is. It looks like your Sentencing

1 memo with attachments. It may have been filed - this one was filed on 6, 6/1/21. 2 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: I'm sorry, you said on 6 --3 4 THE COURT: Document 33. MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, I don't believe 5 6 that's Court's involved in. THE COURT: Maybe -- it looks like it was part of 7 The, the order attached is --8 the record. 9 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Is the, is the sealing order attached to what was filed on the record? 10 11 THE COURT: Yeah. You've asked that your 12 Sentencing memo be filed under seal, correct? 13 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct. 14 THE COURT: Alright. I, I'm going to sign that 15 order too. I assume there's no objection today. 16 MR. LOWE: No objection, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Alright. Let me just sign that. And 18 we'll make, make that order part of the record also. And 19 that's in both cases, that'll be filed in both cases. 20 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Alright. Let me just show this to 22 Ms. Taylor-Smith. Can you just, just explain to me the 23 difference? Let's see, if we can have our staff here --24 they look identical but they're filed under different 25 numbers. I just want to make sure.

1 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Sir, I actually have no idea how this could've happened. 2 3 THE COURT: You've got to --4 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Oh, I have no idea how this --THE COURT: Wait, wait, wait. First, 5 6 you've got to speak into a mic. 7 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: I'm sorry. THE COURT: If this is going to be on the order, 8 9 you have to speak into a mic. 10 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, I know exactly 11 what happened. 12 THE COURT: Go ahead. 13 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your, your court deputy was 14 out last week and so when I filed my Sentencing Memorandum 15 initially, I emailed it to your chambers asking that it be 16 filed under seal, but because I don't have the ability 17 myself to file documents under seal, I sent it to my 18 admin- my legal assistant as well telling her that it's 19 already been forwarded to chambers; however, it needed to 20 be filed under seal. It looks like both, what I send to 21 chambers initially and what I gave to my legal assistant, 22 which are exactly the same documents, both got filed under 23 seal. 24 THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure I put 25 on the record everything I've considered and those are

duplicates. So, has anything else been submitted that I 1 2 have not referred to? 3 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Nothing from the defense. 4 MR. LOWE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. At this point, we have to 5 6 place Mr. May under oath. 7 ESR/CLERK A.J. FOLLMER: Mr. May, please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm the 8 9 testimony you're about to give to this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help 10 11 you God or you do so affirm? 12 DEFENDANT: I do. 13 ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: Please state your full name, 14 spell your last name for the record. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Justin David May. Last name M-A-16 Υ. 17 ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Alright. Mr. May, I, I just have to 19 ask you a few questions. Do you understand that you're 20 here for sentencing today? THE DEFENDANT: I do, Your Honor. 21 22 THE COURT: And have you had enough time to 23 discuss sentencing with your attorney? 24 THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: If you need more time, you can have

```
1
     it. Do you need more time?
              THE DEFENDANT: I do not, Your Honor.
 2
 3
              THE COURT:
                         And is there any reason why we should
 4
     not proceed to sentencing today?
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: Same question for Ms. Taylor-Smith.
     Any reason why we shouldn't proceed to sentencing today?
 7
 8
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: No, Your Honor.
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Lowe?
10
              MR. LOWE: No, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: Alright. Mr. May, have you read the
12
     revised Presentence Report dated March 10, 2020?
1.3
              THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: And have you reviewed the report with
15
     your attorney?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: And did your attorney explain to you
18
     what's in the Presentence Report and what it means?
19
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
              THE COURT: Did she answer all your questions
21
     about the report and what's in the report?
2.2
              THE DEFENDANT: I did, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT: Do you need any additional time to
     talk to counsel about what's in the Presentence Report?
24
25
              THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Alright. Now, is there anything in the report that is, is being objected to? And I, I might preface that by saying I read in the Defendant's Sentencing Memorandum, I believe, that there was some challenge to the sophisticated means enhancement. MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. And, and let's see, is that the only challenge to what's in the Presentence Report? MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor. There was initially an objection made to the loss amount but based upon the method used to calculate the intended loss in this mat- in this man- in this matter, I'm withdrawing my objection to the loss amount. THE COURT: Alright. So, the loss amount as calculated by the U.S. Probation Officer is, is not being objected to? MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That is correct. THE COURT: Alright. Now --MR. LOWE: Your Honor, before we get into the objection, I just wanted to point out, Ms. Taylor-Smith --THE COURT: You got, you've got to speak into a mic, Mr. Lowe. MR. LOWE: I'm sorry, Your Honor. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. LOWE: Ms. Taylor-Smith may want to withdraw

the objection to intended loss because the defendant did - excuse me, to sophisticated means, the defendant did stipulate in the plea agreement in case number 18-026 that the Cisco and Microsoft fraud schemes utilized sophisticated means that the defendant himself personally utilized sophisticated means in connection with the schemes and that his offense level should be increased by plus 2 under section 2(b)1.1(b)10(c) of the guidelines. And that's, that paragraph 11(b) at page 10 of the plea agreement. If he continues to assert this objection, it's yet another breech of the plea agreement. I think he may want to rethink this objection. If not, I'm prepared to argue it.

THE COURT: Alright. I, I noticed that too in

THE COURT: Alright. I, I noticed that too in the plea agreement that, that paragraph dealing with an agreement on sophisticated means. Let me see. And that's paragraph 11(b) you just read, read from in criminal number 18-26.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Court's indulgence. Your Honor, I will withdraw my objection.

THE COURT: Alright. So, there's, there's no objection to what's in the Presentence Report from either side at this point, correct?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. LOWE: Correct, Your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Alright. And so, the first thing I want to do is calculate the applicable federal sentencing guidelines in this case and I, I, I like to say it at the beginning of the sentencing proceeding that we have in, as part of the federal judiciary, a United States Sentencing Commission. And the Sentencing Commission has promulgated a, a quidelines manual. The latest manual is dated 2018 and, in this manual, which is quite extensive at this point, it wasn't as extensive back in 1987 when the quidelines were first put in place in the federal system, but the manual contains information about rating offenses, rating defendants, does the defendant have prior conviction or no prior conviction. There's a lot of information in the quideline manual and before 1987 if two people committed the same crime and both of them, let's say, had no prior record, and the crime carried a penalty of, let's say, zero to 10 years imprisonment, if one defendant appeared before one judge, the defendant might get once sentence and if that defendant appeared before another judge, he might get a completely, completely different sentence than the first judge imposed. And it wasn't considered fair and it's not fair. And an attempt to make sure people are treated fairly and with parity in sentencing, in 1987 through legislation passed by the Congress, a quideline system went in, into, into effect.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in the back of this big book I'm holding up, there's a, what we call a sentencing table with offense levels and, as you go across the age, prior - how many criminal history points a person has and there are quideline ranges for a sentence, especially a sentence for imprisonment in, in the manual that we look to. And until 2005, what was contained in this manual was the guideline ranges the judge found at sentencing was mandatory. The judge had to impose a sentence within that range unless there was some reason to, what we call, depart from it for reasons that are contained in, inside the manual. In 2005, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a decision and said if this system of sentencing, quideline sentencing is to be constitutional, the guidelines are only advisory, they're just quidelines, they're not mandatory. And we have another federal law. It's, it's found in 18 USC Section 3553(a) which lists all the factors that we have to consider before we sentence someone and one of the factors is the sentencing quidelines. But we're still required to calculate the guidelines at sentencing and the probation officer has calculated the guidelines for the two cases and it's in the Presentence Report. So, let me go through these, these guidelines. The -- there are what we call two groups of offenses here. Some of these offenses, for purposes of calculating the guidelines, are combined but

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

some of them aren't. Usually, the fraud and money laundering counts are combined in one group but Mr. May is also charged with two counts of tax evasion and that's not grouped with the fraud and money laundering guidelines. And we have provisions within the sentencing manual on how to handle different groups of offenses. So, with respect to group one, the fraud and money laundering offenses, I'm looking at page 30 of the Presentence Report in paragraph The quideline for a violation of 18 USC Section 1341 is found in guideline section 2B1.1. That section provides that an offense involving mail fraud has base offense level of 7, that says statutory maximum term of imprisonment is 20 years or more under section 2B1.1(a)1, an offense level of 7 would be the base offense level. There's a specific offense characteristic that would increase the base offense level since the intended loss in this case exceeded 3.5 million but was less than 9.5 million, specifically, agreed upon intended loss of \$3,631,647.66. The base offense level is increased by 18 levels pursuant to guideline section 2B1.1(b)(1)(J). There are three other reasons why the offense level is increased in this case. In paragraph 67, there's a specific offense characteristic that was referred to earlier, the offense level is increased by two levels since the defendant personally utilized sophisticated

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

means in connection with the offenses. Under 2B1.1(b)(10)(C), there's a two-level increase. Paragraph 70 notes that there's a three-level increase for, for obstructing justice. The defendant committed the conduct charge in 19-417 while on bond pending sentencing in criminal number 18-26. Since the statutory enhancement under 18 USC Section 3147 applies, the offense level is increased by three levels under sentencing guideline section 3C1.3. There's also another upward offense level adjustment for obstruction of justice for another reason. The defendant registered false domain names during the fraud scheme and the statutory enhancement under 18 USC Section 3559(g)(1) applies; therefore, two levels are added under guideline section 3C1.4. So, for group one, the group one offenses of fraud and money laundering, the adjusted offense level is a total of 32. For the tax evasion group two offense, the guideline for a violation of 26 USC 7201 is found in 2T1.1 of the guidelines and pursuant to that provision of the guidelines, a base offense level is a level from another guideline provision, 2T4.1 which is the tax table corresponding to the tax loss, which in this case was \$52,497.00. Since the tax loss was more than \$40,000.00 but less than \$100,000.00, the offense level is 14 for the group two tax evasion charges and that's pursuant to guideline section 2T4.1(a).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is a specific offense characteristic that adds two offense levels to that base offense level, the tax evasion. Two levels are added because the defendant failed to report or correctly identify the source of income exceeding \$10,000.00 in any year from criminal activity. So, pursuant to guideline section 2 -2T1.1(b)(1), speci- the, there's a two-level increase and, more specifically, the defendant earned at least \$26,071.00 in 2015 and \$213,570.00 in 2016, consisting almost exclusively of fraud proceeds. There is no other adjustment under the group two tax offense, yeah, tax, tax offense - tax evasion group so that the adjusted offense level would be 16. Now, we have two groups of offenses, one with an offense level of 32, one with an offense level of 16 and we have to do under the guidelines what we call a multiple count adjustment and units are assigned under another provision of the guideline. This is in paragraph 80. The total number of units would be one. There, there are no units for the count - the group two counts. Therefore, under section 31 - 3D1.4 of the guideline, the way the quidelines work, there would be no increase in the highest offense, offense level for the group one offense so that the combined adjusted offense level is 32 as indicated in the table at 3D1.4. So, the total offense level is, as noted in paragraph 86 of the Presentence

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Report, is 32. Mr. May has an adult convictions to which criminal history point attach. In 2012, at age 22, he plead guilty and was sentenced for criminal mischief, doing damage to property under \$1,000.00 and disorderly conduct. And that's in paragraph 88. Paragraph 89, 1/16/2018 at age 28, he has a conviction for terroristic threats. He plead quilty and was sentenced and one point is attached to that conviction. So, as a result of these convictions, he has a subtotal criminal history score of 2 and that's noted in paragraph 90 in the Presentence Report. Paragraph 91 says that the defendant committed the conduct in the first case before me, criminal number 19-417, while he was on probation in New Castle County, Delaware for one of those offenses I mentioned and therefore two points are added under guideline section 4A1.1(d) so that his total criminal history score is 4. And according to the sentencing table in the, in the quidelines that I held up in the back of the book, a criminal history score of 4 establishes that he be placed in what we call criminal history category 3. As noted in paragraph 126 of the Presentence Report, based upon a total offense level of 32 and a criminal history category of 3, the guideline range for imprisonment is 151 to 188 months and, again, this is not, this is just one factor I have to consider in deciding the sentence in this case.

But we're required to calculate the guidelines initially at sentence under the law and I also have to ask counsel whether or not there are any departures being advanced pursuant to what's in the guideline manual or just whether counsel is going to pursue variances from the, the guideline. Any departures, Mr. Lowe?

MR. LOWE: No, no, Your Honor.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, there are no motion for departure. I do, however, have a motion for a variance.

THE COURT: Yes. Alright. So, at this point, let me hear from Ms. Taylor-Smith as to what would be an appropriate sentence, advocating obviously for a variance.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, if, if the Court just wants me to start off with what I believe would be an appropriate sentence in this matter, I think that if the Court were to take into consideration where the sentencing guidelines came out in terms of the, the final base offense level or the total offense level that this Court has taken into consideration, I would ask that the Court consider varying down approximately seven levels. And the reason for my request is that as I stated in my Presentence - in my Sentencing Memorandum, most of the guidelines in this case are driven by the intended loss amount. And while the defendant does not object to the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

calculation of the intended loss amount because we believes it's correct, I think that I put into my Sentencing Memorandum that the Court should at least consider my client's neurological disorder in, in, in determining whether or not he participated in this offense as a result of greed, whether or not he was trying to get rich, whether or not he ultimately ended up with anything close to three million dollars or three plus million dollars, either him or any of his co- his co-schemers or whether or not it was more as a function of, based on what we've seen in the psychiatric report, the rigid repetitiveness of the crime itself and how my client's neurological disorder lends to the same. Additionally, Your Honor, prior to his commission of the second offense in this case that he plead quilty before the Court, Mr. May was in fact being considered by the Government for a 5K1.1 motion which I will discuss in further detail as a result of the cooperation that he had provided to the Government. He met with agents of the Government before he was arrested and provided information on both his own crime and the crimes of others. He met with the Government after he was arrested, after he was indicted on the initial case and provided detailed information, not only as to his own criminal activity but as to the identity and criminal activity of the co-schemers in this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

case and the, at least online identity of individuals who were committing a number of cybercrimes across the United States. And finally, he even assisted in the apprehension of an individual who had eluded law enforcement for at least a few months who I believe was wanted out of Florida for drug - drug trafficking offenses. I'm asking that the Court take those things into consideration when the Court is fashioning a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than is necessary to meet the sentencing goals of 3553(a). And so, that would be my request, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. Now, you, you want me to depart seven levels. So, as I look at the book from level 32, you want me to go down to level 25 and criminal history category 3 to 70 to 87 months? MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. And, Counsel, you alluded to his, his I'll call it mental disorder? MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: I, I read the, the doctor's report. Can you elucidate on that a bit more? MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Of course, Your Honor. Your Honor, as this Court is aware, my client is an individual living with ASD. He lives with the spectrum -- he's living, an individual living with autism. He's on the spectrum. As a result of this, and I was going to go into

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this in more detail when I just gave my sentencing remarks, but as a result of his developmental disorder, it is something that he was born with. It is something that he has struggled with his entire life but as a result of his disorder, he has difficulty with a syndrome that the psychiatrist calls mind blindness. Essentially, it may seem to others that he has a lack of respect for other individuals, not just the law but for other individuals. It may appear to others that he has a lack of empathy for his own actions but what it is, is that he truly has difficulty, real difficulty associating his own behaviors with the impact that those behaviors have on the outside world. He simply has, has trouble with it. He is better, according to the psychiatrist, when he has prosocial when he's surrounded by a prosocial community. The Court will notice from both the Presentence Report that was originally written and from the psychiatric report, Mr. May did a really good job of separating himself and his criminal activities from the family that loved him and supported him and is present today in the courtroom. And as a result of that, what Mr. May calls his tether to mainstream society have been cut and that ultimately led him to retreat to an online world where he learned this scheme. I, I don't want the Court to be confused about how this all came about. It's not as if Mr. May one day

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

woke up and said I think it would be a great idea if I made up fake serial numbers and decided to defraud Cisco and, and Lenovo and Microsoft of millions of dollars. Someone else that he encountered online was participating in this scheme and because Mr. May's disorder kind of forces him to mimic the behaviors of others, particularly if he is seeking some sort of social acceptance from those individuals. You will note in a letter that was written by his step-father, there is a story about when Mr. May was a child and that the only kind of prosocial communications that he had with his classmates was when he learned how to put video games on the school computer. And so, for a short period of time, he was a hero to individuals who otherwise would not even speak to him in the hallways. His participation in this online criminal scheme began that way. I, I would ask that the Court --Court's indulgence, because I want to read specifically from the psychiatric report. According to Dr. Weiss, Weiss, seeking human contact as persons' with ASD do, his world became his online connections. With his deficits, he found peer acceptance without fully appreciation for the wrongfulness of his actions. That is, he became adept at the mechanics of the cybercrimes for which he was convicted but did not understand the moral reason that they were wrong. This deficit is in the cognitive domain

1.3

of theory of mind or mind blindness, the ability to appreciate the mental state of others.

of the considerations here is the fact that while he was on pretrial release in the first case, he engaged in the same exact conduct in the second case. And a concern a Court would have is, given the, the condition he has, that when he's released, he might be susceptible to doing it again. What's, what's to prevent that because he's - even after he's released from custody, he's in custody now, he'll still be under what's called supervised release of the Court and we don't want to see him back, want him to be a good citizen and a productive citizen. What, what would be, what's being done to protect the public from further crimes like this, by this, 'cause there are, there are definite victims in a case like this?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, I actually wrote something specific to that for the Court. And when I talk about specific deterrent as it relates to Mr. May, there is no doubt that he did not fully appreciate what a period of incarceration looked like. I, I, I know this from my personal interactions with him. I know this from interactions with his family members. There's no doubt that although he may have seen what incarceration looked like in movie theaters, he did not appreciate the impact

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that a period of incarceration would have on an individual who is living with ASD as himself. Imagine for a moment, Your Honor, the level of stimuli that he is subjected to on a regular and consistent basis while he is in prison. Mr. May and other individuals who are on the spectrum function best when they can create regimens for themselves and follow those regimens. And during this period of incarceration, he had been subjected to sounds and sights and lighting and physical touching that on a regular consistent basis is essentially torturous to him. As a result, after he was incarcerated in this case, he reached out to his family in a way that he had not since he left the family home. He included his mother in every decision that he was making from pleading quilty to the second indictment, to showing up for sentencing, to helping gather letters on his behalf in a way that he had completely excluded her. If you read the Present- the original Presentence Report, Ms. May told you he told his family nothing about the fact that he had been federally indicted for a crime and even at that point in time when he was cooperating with the Government, was looking at a significant period of incarceration in a federal prison. He kept them completely out, out of the loop. But as this Court is aware from the bail hearing, since his period of incarceration, his prosocial interactions in the community have in fact buttressed and re-anchored him back into mainstream society. His disorder essentially is such that he mimics the behavior of those who are closest to him and he had excluded his family and his prosocial supports from his life during the period of time that he was committing criminal offenses. They are here today, Your Honor, to tell you that not only do they continue to support him today but they will support him when he is released from incarceration.

THE COURT: Alright.

1.3

2.2

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: He also has a new appreciation for his relationship with the medical community. Prior to his period of incarceration, he went to his therapist on a regular and consistent basis because the medication that he was receiving from his therapist helped him function from day to day. It was a stimulant, one he is unable to get while he's in a Bureau of Prison. But it really helped him focus and be able to, to do tasks. He didn't take the rest of the therapy, therapy as seriously. He did not take the rest of the therapy to heart and it was because, again, part of Mr. May's disorder is that he's able to compartmentalize or was able to compartmentalize and because the therapist has no idea that he was involved in criminal activity, the therapist had no way to redirect him. When he's under Court supervision, that will not be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the case. He will -- I would ask that this Court have some sort of mental health component to whenever he is released from custody. And so, he will be able to continue with the prosocial interactions that he has in the community, with his mother, his step-father, his brother, his friends, his real friends, Your Honor, individuals not just that he met online, not just anonymous faces but individuals who have met him and, unlike other people that he's met during the course of his life, since he started school, met him and genuinely care about Mr. May, genuinely have affection for Mr. May, affection that he could reciprocate in a real way, in a way that he had difficulty doing as a young child because of the, the extra stimuli. So, those are some of the things that I ask the Court to take into, to consideration when the Court is thinking about specific deterrence as it relates to Mr. May.

THE COURT: Just one other question and then I'll hear from your witnesses. As someone with autism spectrum disorder, ASD, he's been prescribed medi- a medication but I'm reading that that medication is not available in the, in the prison system.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct.

THE COURT: Have you looked into that to see if there's any special way he can get it?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, he cannot get the same medication that he was receiving when he was in the community.

THE COURT: Does he get --

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: The med— that medication is a sti— it has a stimulant and, and, and because it's a stimulant, the Bureau of Prisons will not disseminate it. They will give him something else.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: But it is, it just, it does not allow him to function clear-minded the way he did when he was in the community. And so, for however long he is incarcerated until the Bureau of Prisons changes their policy on disseminating or dispensing stimulants to individuals who are incarcerated -- I think it is probably because they are concerned that there could be some sort of abuse of those types of substances. So, just like any other substance that is distributed, whether or not that be an opioid, you can't get an opiate in prison either, so it's that, you know, Tylenol with codeine while you're in prison, you get Tylenol or you get Motrin and you deal with the, the pain that might have been satisfied had you been able to, to get an opiate. The Bureau of Prisons -and I don't fault this, for this, I mean, they, they have their policy for a reason but the medication that worked

for Mr. May he will not be able to get while he is incarcerated because it includes a stimulant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But he's getting some medication.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: He is getting some medication, Your Honor, and it does allow him in some respects to function. I know that when he first was incarcerated in this matter, he, he could not have a sustained conversation with me without losing focus, with, without crying, without really not cooperating with his own defense. He was not asleep and he wasn't slurring his words, he just had difficulty putting his thoughts down. And so, we worked on some strategies for him, taking notes when he was in his prison cell for example and keeping a pad near him when questions came to mind so that the next time I came to visit him, he wouldn't have to think about what it was he wanted to ask me. He would've written those things down at some point in time earlier and he could just bring the pad down to me. So, he's learning some ways to, to cope with it but he simply does not function the same way without the stimulant.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: And with that, Your Honor, at this point I would call Susan Stanton.

THE COURT: Alright.

ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: Remain standing. Please

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give to this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God or you do so affirm?

WITNESS SUSAN STANTON: I do.

ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: Please state your full name, spell your last name for the record.

MS. STANTON: My name is Susan Stanton. My last name is S-T-A-N-T-O-N.

ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: Thank you.

MS. STANTON: Good morning, Your Honor. Justin's mother. I want to touch on a few different things. I thank you for taking the time to read my I went into some great detail in that about how letter. Justin's autistic spectrum disorder affects him and it forms all of the things that he's dealing with. provided you with that information because I wanted to highlight that his psychological makeup differs a lot from the typical person you may encounter in your courtroom. On paper, and I understand this, he appears troubled with a blatant disregard for the law but the truth is that the real Justin, the Justin that you're seeing here today is profoundly affected by his neurological disorder. Justin was diagnosed with this since the age of seven. It is not something new. As far as medication goes, I don't if

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you've reviewed his complete medical records but it is thick. We have gone through every medication that exists in trying to find the best thing to treat him. There is no medication per se for autistic spectrum disorders. You treat whatever symptoms are showing at the time. stimulant medication for someone like my son doesn't have the same effect it would have on you or I where we'd be bouncing off the wall. It instead acts on a different neurotransmitter and it helps keep him calm, it provides him with, you know, an ability to focus. It's what helped in some way get him through school. Throughout his entire school year, I worked tirelessly with teachers and administration people. Each year we would draw up IEPs, which are individual educational profiles to give Justin assistive technology. He had a one-on-one aid. He was allowed extra time for the tests. He was given a guiet place retreat when stimuli was too much for him. He's really quite simply, even at his age, a, a perfect example of what a young man with an autistic spectrum disorder looks like. At the time, it was thought to be Asperger's. We now know that as being autistic spectrum disorder. address something that you brought up just recently, what is going to change as far as once Justin is finally released, because prior to both of his combined cases, starting in 2018, Justin did not let any of us know.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

family, he's got family fried who are all here today, we all adore him. He did not let us know exactly what was going on because had we known, things would've been very different. He would've lived in my home. He would've had some supervision. You know, we would've made sure that once he was -- when he was initially released pending his sentencing, he would've been heavily supervised. He does need to be supervised. He also needs the ability to see his therapist, a physician, to continue with his medication regime so that we can get him to a point where he can be a much more productive member of society, especially now that all of this has happened. My son is taking accountability for his actions, in my opinion, by pleading quilty to these combined charges, he's sparing the Government the expense of a trial. We're trying to move past this dark point in his life. Justin does know and he does understand that time has to be served for these crimes but at this point, we are now closing in on 23 months that he has been in federal custody for these charges. He has experienced the pandemic while incarcerated, which has been, you know, additionally traumatic and difficult for him, as I imagine it's been for anyone afflicted with an autistic spectrum disorder. My son's also an incredibly intelligent and smart young He's got a lot of potential. He's got so many

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

positive things to contribute to society. When he's released, he has a place to stay in our home indefinitely. He not only has the support of myself, my husband, his father, his brother, friends that are here today but we now know what's going on. And without previously having known, we had no way of knowing that things were this severe. Had I known, you know, when he was first initially released pending his first case that here are the things you have to follow, he would've been following We can't do something when we don't know what's going on and, you know, Justin in his mind, I'm sure, was thinking I want to be an adult. I don't want to rely on my disability. I don't want to get my parents involved and have them worry and I understand that. We've all gone through that as we grow up but now that we all know, everyone that cares about him, we can take care of this. We can, personally, you know, we will make sure that he is seeing his doctor, that he is now seeing a therapist, he needs to work past the reasons for these behaviors. Recidivism is not an option for Justin. Justin has never, prior to these combined cases, served a day in jail. mentioned a few other things that have happened to him, Justin never spent a night in a jail, let alone nearly two years. And I know that in that time, he's had time to reflect on the reasoning for this. He's described it to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

me as an extreme lack of self-confidence. Justin has always been looking for ways to fit in socially and with people with autistic spectrum disorders, they're like sponges, regardless of the age and they absorb what's around them. If you're surrounded by positive role models, friends that are going to show you, life can be very different, that's what you absorb. Unfortunately, you know, in the incarcerated environment he's surrounded by, like Ms. Taylor-Smith mentioned, if you're surrounded by a lot of things that are not going to be good things for someone afflicted like he is, and, and that's what we want to see. You know, an extended sentence means he's going to be once again around poor models of behavior. I'm proud of him for how strong he's been through this. You know, he's kept his head down. He works in the jail He's made progress and yet there's so much more progress for us to make with him as family and friends once he is released. You were kind enough, you know, to give him a second chance before as far as releasing him prior to the sentencing and then this other case happened. The difference being now, everybody's onboard, everybody knows what's happening, there are no secrets and, and we're all about him, we're all about helping him and making sure he's never going to set foot in a courtroom again for anything like this. He's got way too much to

1.3

offer to be throwing his life away like this. So, I hope in deciding your sentencing, I understand you have all the guidelines but I hope you're taking into consideration everything that Dr. Weiss has had to say and reading his medical files, understanding where Justin's at today in 2021 versus 2018, that things have changed. And the main thing that's changed is he has the support of his family, which, you know, as I was saying, I made sure he got all the way through school. I can continue, you know — it's never-ending what we as parents are willing to do for our son. So, thank you for taking the time to talk to me. I hope that you will show some kindness in deciding his sentence.

THE COURT: Don't leave yet. I have one or two questions for you.

MS. STANTON: Sure.

THE COURT: First of all, he is so fortunate in having you in his life.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ STANTON: Thank you, I'm very fortunate having him in my life.

THE COURT: He's a very lucky young man. Also, and just curious, have you visited with him at the detention center?

MS. STANTON: I visit him every opportunity I, I have. Prior to, you know, the whole pandemic thing, I was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seeing him nearly every week when some of his friends weren't. Once things opened in October, I was able to see him a few times and now that things have opened since March, I'm there pretty much almost any week that I can, that someone else isn't visiting him. So, he visits with me almost every week. We talk every other day. We email all the time so I've had a lot of time to talk to him about the serious things and to hear him tell me, you know, mom, like, you know, this just got out of hand. And, and really, he, he needed this to happen to stop this cycle. You know, he was caught up in something that was so much bigger than him and he needed that to stop. He has such a good support system in his friends, good friends, like real friends, people like Ms. Taylor-Smith said, people that know him and love him and accept him exactly how he is. He doesn't have to, you know, pretend to be something he's not. So, he has right now and will continue to have good positive role models of social behavior, which is what really all individuals, children through adults need when they are afflicted with an autistic spectrum disorder. They need to be around people that are going to emulate the kind of positive behavior that we all want to see from him. We want to see him be a productive member of society and I believe strongly that with all of our help he will be that young man.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Alright. I, I do have a few other questions. First of all, after he's released from custody, he goes on supervised release, I'm going to make a condition of that, that he, he doesn't have unmonitored access to a computer. MS. STANTON: That's fine. THE COURT: Through the probation office, they put a device on the computer that would have to be enforced. MS. STANTON: That will be. THE COURT: He wasn't living with you at the time he committed these offenses? MS. STANTON: He was not. He was living independently. THE COURT: And what assurance do you have that he'll live with you? MS. STANTON: I'm sorry. THE COURT: What assurance do you have he'll live with you when you get out? MS. STANTON: We've recently bought a, a large four-bedroom home. I have more than enough room for Justin. He's got his own area. You know, I would have no issue whatsoever, nor does he, with any type of computer supervision, monitoring needs to be done. THE COURT: And --

MS. STANTON: This time in jail has taught Justin that, you know, there's going to be some things you're going to have to do once you're released and I know that he will follow them to the letter. He will also have our supervision to make sure that that happens.

THE COURT: Alright. I, I'm not sure how much you, you know about the offenses that he committed here.

MS. STANTON: I do. I'm fully aware of his offenses. I've read, you know, everything on paper, you know, everything.

THE COURT: I'm reading that he has GED degree.

MS. STANTON: He actually has a high school diploma and did attend a semester at Wilmington University. So, he is, you know, he is - he did not initially graduate high school but he did have a GED and attended briefly some university.

THE COURT: Now, I, I'm just curious. This crime was so sophisticated with use of the computers. He went into the computers, he got serial numbers of all these parts, hard drives, services from Microsoft. It's incredible how he did all that and then he spent a considerable amount of time talking to rep- repair people on the phone in these different corporations, Cisco, Microsoft. Obviously, lying to them all the time, trying to convince them he, that they should send him a duplicate

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because he had a part that was defective and he was supposed to send back the part after he got the new one but, obviously, he had no part to send back. This was a, an offense involving four major companies that went on over a considerable period of time. Where did he learn all these different things about computers?

MS. STANTON: Justin's very sophisticated as far as -- Justin does and has always had a lot of computer knowledge. Much like I was saying before though, part of that is he's associating and was at the time, he was associating with individuals that were making it seem it's exciting, this is fun. And, like a sponge, he's absorbing This is a way of social acceptance with these shady peers. And, you know, the more things I do, the more they're impressed with me so I continue. And I, I think a lot of that was without him fully realizing, you know, there were no repercussions for him. You know, he wasn't being arrested. Other people were hey, great, Justin, high five, you know. He was being, he was modeling the poor behavior that he was seeing from other people on the internet, taking their advice and running with it and concocted this very elaborate scheme that, you know, was netting him a lot of money. And it really, it wasn't even about the money. It was about social acceptance. things like that, you know, happened in youth where you,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you know, download some stuff you're not supposed to but all your peers think you're terrific for it. That kind of thing left unchecked and get to this point. You know, and again, with proper supervision from his family and friends, he's not going to be in that spot again. He's learned a ton in the last two years, having to go through being incarcerated and seeing how this has affected his life. And, you know, he'll tell you himself, this is not something that will happen again. Recidivism for Justin is something I won't allow and, and none of us will allow. It is not an option for him. He is not, you know, a criminal. He's made some very bad choices, some bad criminal choices but he's capable of so much more. Just that, you know, just what has happened himself, has happened itself, shows you he's incredibly smart with That smartness and that skill can translate computers. into many other socially acceptable profitable jobs for him to allow him to become a contributing member of society. THE COURT: Okay. I, I have nothing further. Any cross-examination? MR. LOWE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. Thank you. MS. STANTON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

```
MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, I believe Ms.
 1
     Stanton will be speaking for the entire family but I would
 2
 3
     at least like to acknowledge the other individuals who
 4
     appeared in court today.
 5
              THE COURT: You may.
 6
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, also present in
     the courtroom on behalf of Mr. May is David Stanton. That
 7
     would be his step-father. Alex May who is his younger
 8
 9
     brother. Andrew Huddington (ph) I believe.
10
              MR. PUDDINGTON: Puddington.
11
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry, Puddington (ph)
12
     and --
13
              JACOB TABALLA: Jacob Taballa.
14
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Can you spell your last name
15
     for me please?
16
              MR. TABALLA: T-A-B-A-L-L-A.
17
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Jacob Taballa, all present in
18
     the courtroom on behalf of Mr. May.
19
              THE COURT: Alright. I'm assuming that Mr.
     Puddington and Taballa are friends.
20
21
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor.
22
     Mr. Puddington actually is one of the individuals who
23
     submitted the letter to the Court.
24
              THE COURT: Yeah. I, I read his letter.
25
     Alright. Anything else you want to say to the Court?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, no. I just -- let me make sure I touched on everything and answered the Court's questions. No, Your Honor, I know that my client is going to address the Court at some point when the Court allows him to allocute so I'm not going to discuss too much this portion but I just want the Court to, to take this into consideration as well. After having had had conversations with Mr. May about what was in his mind or what was he thinking, after he was released from, by this Court, and awaiting sent- and awaiting sentencing when he committed the additional offenses? Mr. May is going to talk about this in a little bit more detail. The Court has seen Dr. Weiss' assessment of him and so I just want to read that portion into the record. "While it cannot be denied that persons with development disabilities and mental disorders can plan and execute crimes, it is important that individual's narratives and unique qualities be considered in calculating their ultimate culpability. Mr. May having contemplated his behavior for much of 2018 took responsibility for his actions. He did not, however, anticipate the devastating effects of severing ties with the online world that he had created. The continuation of his criminal behavior represents presuicidal behavior as he did not expect to survive. Thus, while the later sequence was intentional in the

1.3

2.2

sense that" -- I'm sorry, "in the sense of the

Government's observations that he is a repeat offender,

there is a second narrative. That far from enriching

himself, Mr. May was trying to preserve fragments of his

identity while knowing he was saying farewell to the

world. This interpretation is not meant to romanticize

criminal behavior, rather to add appropriate complexity to

the motivations of an impaired individual." And with

that, the Defense would rest.

THE COURT: Alright. Mr. May, I'll have, I'll hear anything you want to say to the Court before sentence.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Now.

THE DEFENDANT: Now?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Yeah.

THE DEFENDANT: Oh okay. I'm sorry. I just need a moment. Good morning, Your Honor. I appreciate the opportunity to address the Court. I intend to make a few brief remarks. I, first and most of all, wish to apologize to my numerous victims. I deeply regret everything. Particular shame is felt with regards to the time and energy I forced investigators at the victim corporations to expend in tracking me down.

THE COURT: Alright, I'm going to ask you to speak closer into the mic and --

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, I'm sorry. Should I start 1 2 over or --THE COURT: No, that's okay. 3 But --4 THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry. THE COURT: -- speak, speak a little slower. 5 6 Okay? 7 THE DEFENDANT: My actions are indefensible and I will make no attempt to defend them. I, I apologize for 8 9 the fraud I committed and the impact it had on the victim I also apologize for the pain I've caused 10 corporations. 11 my family and friends. I would also like to provide a bit 12 of context in my view for some of the criminal acts by 13 sharing my thoughts at the time I committed them. 14 Specifically, I'd like to address the offenses I committed 15 while on pretrial release, which is something that I did. 16 I committed offenses while on pretrial release. 17 believe that my intention was to box myself in. 18 why, while committing the offense, I provided my real name 19 and address to the victim corporation numerous times. 20 idea was in part that by using my real name, that would 21 surely result in a quick arrest and maybe that would 22 finally, you know, give me the courage to do what I 23 planned, which was to commit suicide at the time of the

arrest, knowing that all was over. That was the plan but

I want to be clear, nothing excuses the actions committed,

24

25

the other things that I did. I'm only just trying to share my mental state at the time just to say that I wasn't in a very good place. Throughout all my offenses, I kept friends and family secluded and that was a major mistake. Other people are like tethers to me, they keep me attached to the world around me and around them. By not sharing what I've done and what I've put myself and others through, I hurt both them and myself and I regret that immensely. Today, things are different. I have the full support of family and friends who provide me with the strength to withstand whatever comes next. I've seen where my worst actions live - lead and I live with the consequences of them. And though it's hard for me to express it, I am truly and deeply sorry. I, I thank the Court for allowing me to speak today.

THE COURT: Alright. Anything further, Ms. Taylor?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Nothing further from the Defense, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright, let me, let me hear from the Government. Mr. Lowe.

MR. LOWE: Your Honor, we have on the phone with us Mr. Tim Castro from Cisco Corporation who is going to represent the victim and he would like to speak. But before we get to him, I'd just, I want to start out by

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
saying, and this may surprise Ms. Taylor-Smith and Mr.
May, I agree that his autism spectrum disorder should
warrant and does warrant a sentence below the guidelines.
I'll start with that. I just don't agree with the extent
of the departure that Ms. Taylor-Smith is asking for and I
can explain a little bit why. But, but I do think that he
doesn't need 151 months in prison and I do think that his
autism had something to do with the behavior here. So,
starting with that, I'd like Mr. Castro to get the
opportunity to explain what the consequences were to Cisco
of Mr. May's behavior. Mr. Castro, are you there?
        MR. TIM CASTO: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me
okay?
        MR. LOWE: Can we, can everyone hear him?
Mr. Castro --
        THE COURT: Yeah, I --
        MR. LOWE: -- please go ahead and, and just tell
the Court what it is that you wanted to say on behalf of
Cisco.
        THE COURT: Wait. I, I, I didn't get --
        MR. CASTO: Yes, absolutly, yes thank you.
                   I didn't get his full name.
        THE COURT:
        MR. LOWE: Mr. Castro hold on --
        MR. CASTO: Yeah. Thank you for allowing me the
opportunity to speak here today.
```

MR. LOWE: Mr. Castro, hold on a second. 1 THE COURT: I didn't get his full name. 2 3 MR. LOWE: Your Honor, his name is Tim Castro, C-4 A-S-T-R-O. THE COURT: Alright. Mr. Castro, I'll hear 5 6 whatever you have to say. 7 MR. LOWE: I'm sorry. It's Mr. Tim Casto, C-A-S-T-O, C-A-S-T-O. 8 9 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 10 Sorry, Mr. Casto. MR. LOWE: 11 MR. CASTO: It's okay. No worries. But I was 12 going to correct it and then I, I started my statement, 1.3 thanks. 14 MR. LOWE: Please go ahead. 15 MR. CASTO: Okay. Thank you. The first off, I 16 just want to thank the Court for giving me the opportunity 17 to speak here today and we really appreciate the 18 accommodation to allow me to appear via telephone. So, I 19 just wanted to provide some background and context as to 20 the nature of this fraud scheme and the impact it had on 21 Cisco as well as others. As you may know, Cisco provides 22 equipment, software and services that form the backbone of 23 the internet and other networks. In support of many of 24 Cisco's product lines, Cisco operates a customer service

model that provides for advance replacements. What this

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

means is that Cisco will ship a replacement product to a customer before that customer is required to return that faulty product. Cisco provides this type of support for two reasons. First, it provides assurances to its customers that Cisco will stand behind its products if there is a technical issue or a manufacturing defect. Second, this type of support is necessary as it provides replacements quickly for customers who may be experiencing a network down type of issue where time is of the essence. This is especially important for customers that are in critical infrastructure, for example, banks or healthcare providers. In this particular case, Mr. May and his associates took advantage of this cust- of this Cisco customer support model. They created more than 300 unique Cisco IDs with the intent to defraud Cisco and nearly 400 service requests were initiated that resulted in the shipment of more than 250 products with a list price value of approximately 4.3 million dollars. This type of -excuse me -- the impact of this type of fraud is significant, not only on Cisco but others as well. is, of course, the financial loss in the product sent but there are other impacts as well. There are the cost of third-party logistics in shipping products as well as the storage of products. There's also cost associated with responding to fraudulent requests as this takes time and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

resources away from supporting honest and legitimate customers who may actually be experiencing technical difficulties. Lastly, the parts required through this type of fraud scheme compete with legitimate Cisco resellers who invest heavily in their relationship with Cisco and selling Cisco products. This undermines a healthy robust marketplace for Cisco products as the fraudulently acquired goods can be sold for a much, much lower price than legitimate retailers could obtain for the same product types. Finally, Cisco just wants to acknowledge the Government here. We understand that the Government has many competing priorities and limited resources in deciding which cases to pursue. So, we want to thank the Government for the time and resources devoted to this case, in particular, we'd like to thank Assistant U.S. Attorney Michael Lowe as well as FBI Special Agent Sean Norman. I'm happy to answer any questions the Court may have but that otherwise concludes my statement.

MR. LOWE: I have no questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright. I have no questions, Mr. Casto. Thank you for the, the testimony. It's most helpful and at this point does the defense have any questions?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, Your Honor, I do not have any questions. And just so that the record is

clear, the defense does not object to the testimony of Mr. Casto be it telephonically.

THE COURT: Alright. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOWE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We're, we're going to hang up then on Mr. Casto's phone conversation.

MR. LOWE: Thank you, Mr. Casto.

THE COURT: Terminated. Thank you.

MR. LOWE: Your Honor, returning to what sentence to impose, at least in my opinion. There's a couple of things that I think are important here and, and I'll address some of the points that Ms. Taylor-Smith raised. But I want to start with the, the loss amount and, and as you know, we had stipulated to, in the first case, a loss amount of, I think it was \$3,449,000.00 some odd and that was done as a, as a courtesy. It was done as a courtesy 'cause Mr. May was cooperating at the time and the cutoff for another plus 2 under the guidelines is \$3,500,001.00. So, I, in discussions with Cisco, learned that they have this discount that they offer to legitimate Cisco resellers of 42 percent off of the list pricing. Now, Mr. May was not a legitimate authorized reseller at any point in time but as a courtesy, in order to reach a result that I thought was more fair to him and to keep him below the 3.5 million dollar number, I spoke with Cisco to see how

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they felt about it and they thought it was a fair way to approach the matter. So, we agreed to give him that 3, that 42 percent discount. If we hadn't done that -- and at the end of the day, it's academic because with the additional fraud in the second case, he wound up going above the 3.5-million-dollar number anyway. But the real intended loss that he would've faced absent that kind of a consideration in these cases was \$5,693,439.00. And as I said, at the end of the day, the number that we all stipulated to was 3,631,648, it's the same sentencing range. So, it doesn't matter. But I bring it up because I think it's important to know the scope of the fraud It, it wasn't the 42 percent discount. In reality, it was the, the higher number that he was starting with. I know Mr. May blames a lot of this on his autism and, and I feel for him, I feel for his family and I understand that it makes an impact on how he approaches things in the world. To the extent though that it provides a blanket excuse, that I simply don't agree with. Much of what happened here was calculated intentional conduct that he knew was wrong. We're not talking about a couple of times where he, to make friends on social media or through the internet in chat rooms, engaged in some kind of criminal conduct. This was literally hundreds of times. Cisco, hundreds of times for Microsoft, hundreds of times

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for Lenovo, and he made a lot of money. At a minimum, he made over \$300,000.00 profit and that's reflected in the orders of forfeiture that Your Honor signed. He used that money, among other things, to live, to pay his bills, he bought a \$65,000.00 BMW M2 with his money. He had a cash counting machine in his home and the fact that he knew that all of this was wrong is reflected in the stuff that he did in the first case, to hide his identify. And those are the bases of the money laundering counts that he plead He sold these goods to equipment resellers in quilty to. New Jersey and then took the checks that they gave him and rather than put them in his bank accounts, he took them to a check cashing place and they cashed the checks for him there so that he would have cash and it wouldn't his bank I bring that up, like I said, because I think it's important to understand that he really did know what he was doing was wrong and he did it in part to make money. Now, the second case, he's right. He did use his own name on several occasions. It wasn't as if every claim in the second case was in his own name. Most were not but he did leave a trail, enough of a trail anyway. think part of what happened in the second case, my own personal read on things, is that he didn't want to move in with his, with his mom and I wish he had and he didn't at that time, he was still just making his money the same

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exact way he'd been making it for years, which was committing these types of frauds. Mr. May, obviously, regrets what he did. I mean, he, he hadn't been in prison before and, and I have no doubt that if on one of the earlier occasions in his life if he had spent some time in prison it might've, it might've had an impact. But that's no different than most defendants that we, we deal with who hadn't served any time in prison. Really, no one appreciates the criminality of their conduct until they get put into the MDC and then all of the sudden the world comes crashing down and this becomes very real. And, and I don't doubt that he didn't think that he was going to go to prison. He had cooperated with the Government. I think he was hoping that he would've gotten a big break and, and he very well may have. So, what do to with Mr. May. He's clearly somebody that we have to worry about going forward but I do believe that his autism played a contributing factor and is, is an appropriate 3553 factor warranting some kind of a variance. Ms. Taylor-Smith has asked for a sentencing range of 70 to 87 months, which is less than half of what the advisor guideline range would I think a more fair number would be cutting about a be. third of his sentence, which I think is a pretty generous admission on my part. I, I don't think a lot of people would expect the Government lawyer to come in here and,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and agree for a guy who breeched his plea agreement, committed more crimes and defrauded companies out of like, realistically, five million dollars' worth of product to come in here and say cut him a break of 50 something months. But I think a sentence of about 100 months takes into con- it takes into account everything, not just what he did but sort of mitigating factors that the defense has tried to present to the Court. And I think Ms. Taylor-Smith did a very good job and, and I think she's very fair and reasonable. We're not -- I don't think I'm that far off from where she thinks the number should line and I think the reason that I, I, I'm asking for more time than she is is because of what he did here was not a -- it can't be minimized. This is a massive, massive fraud that netted him and his co-schemers a lot of money and he knew all along that it was wrong, whether or not he had autism, he did it, he did it for money, he made a lot of money and he spent his money. So, I think to sort of send the right message to, to the, to society, to people who might do this kind of thing again, to, to protect the public from future crimes of the defendant and to take into consideration what just punishment would be, I think a sentence of 100 months is fair.

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Your Honor, before we go any further, would it be possible to take about a five to 10-

minute recess for a comfort break for my client? 1 2 THE COURT: Yes. And then I, I do have some 3 questions for Mr. Lowe. Okay. 4 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Thank vou. THE COURT: We'll stand in recess. 5 6 ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: All rise. (Recess from 11:30 a.m. until, 11:38 a.m) 7 MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Thank you for your 8 9 consideration, Your Honor. THE COURT: Alright. Mr. Lowe, Ms. Taylor-Smith 10 11 said that there was some cooperation from --12 MR. LOWE: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: -- this defendant. He assisted in 14 the apprehension of another person? 15 MR. LOWE: He did, Your Honor. There was a, a fugitive on a completely unrelated case but he happened to 16 17 know some information about that person and he provided it 18 to us, to the FBI, who passed it on down to the 19 authorities in, I think it was in Texas or Florida. 20 was in Florida. And they were able to apprehend the 21 individual. 22 THE COURT: And I, I think I heard also that 23 other persons in Texas he cooperated about. 24 MR. LOWE: He did provide information as to those persons. I, I couldn't say if, if he hadn't had breeched 25

his plea agreement, I couldn't say that that would have risen to the level of the 5K. It may have. We, we had a lot of other evidence on those individuals as well, including confessions. But he did provide the information and I think he was certainly well along the path to getting a 5K. I'll be, I'll be perfectly frank about that. He, had he not done what he did while on release, he'd be in a very different position right now than, than he is.

THE COURT: And, and about how many times did he meet with you and/or the, the FBI agent?

MR. LOWE: My recollection is that he proffered at least once if not twice and then he was signed up as an FBI informant and we were going to try to utilize him and his connections, and by we I should say the FBI, in the online social engineering community to see if we could get some evidence on other individuals. That didn't pan out but he did meet with the FBI on several occasions, maybe three or so, to, to try to facilitate something like that. It just, it never went anywhere but he was at least essentially making the effort.

THE COURT: And as part of his cooperation, did he explain the intricacies of what occurred in this case?

MR. LOWE: Yes. He did. He explained how he did what he did and how he was on the social engineering site

that many others were engaged in similar conduct and how they shared information. He explained how he worked with the individuals down in Texas. So, yeah, we went through, we went through what he did and he did explain it in, in detail.

THE COURT: Okay. I, I have no other questions.

Is there anything else anyone wants to put on the record?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Nothing else from the defense,

Your Honor.

MR. LOWE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Alright. A court has to take into account many factors in determining what's an appropriate sentence. I earlier alluded to the fact that we have, I believe I did, a sentencing law 18 USC Section 3553(a) which contains many factors the Court has to consider in determining an appropriate sentence in a given case.

These factors give us guidance. And one of the factors we have to consider, although it's not mandatory, it's only advisory, it's just a guideline, is the, is the federal sentencing guideline. I do note that both, both sides agree that the guidelines as currently calculated would be greater than necessary in this case and there should be some variance from that guideline. One of the factors we have to consider is the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar record who have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

been found quilty of similar conduct. One of the reasons, as I said a lot earlier this morning, before the creation of the guidelines was to make sure that like defendants who commit like crimes are treated essentially the same by different judges. And usually, we look to the guidelines to make sure we avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found quilty of similar conduct. In this case, there is a warranted reason to not look to the applicable guidelines here to satisfy this factor and that the parties essentially agree that there should be a variance, downward variance from the quidelines that I've calculated in this case and is reflected in the Presentence Report. A Court also has to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense. This is a very serious offense, there's no doubt. It involved millions of dollars and there are at least four victims which have spent a considerable amount of time trying to understand what occurred here, working with law enforcement, perhaps modifying the procedures they were following in handling warranty claims or repair claims. I did note that Mr. Castro, Casto said that the loss is considerable in a case like this to a company. Obviously, these companies spend a considerable amount of time and effort to create products which really have enhanced the quality of life of so many in this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

society. And yet, they are preyed upon by persons who have the unique knowledge of how computers work and take advantage of, of the, these companies in a way where, as Mr. Castro said, the loss to the company is considerable. I, I don't want to repeat everything he said but one thing that resonates and it's reflected in the Presentence Report is that it deprives them of the opportunity to serve, provide service to legitimate customers. These are people that, are companies that have paid money for the The product may have had a problem and the company like Cisco and Microsoft, the other companies, they, involved in this case, they have a need to live up to the warranties that they've given to customers and it deprives them of the opportunity to do so. companies are seriously affected by the kind of fraud that was committed in this case, let alone the tax evasion that's associated with the fraud, as Mr. May has plead quilty to. This, this - these, these offenses that are in front of me, fraud, money laundering, tax evasion, occurred over a considerable period of time, involved a lot of planning, a lot of cunning and involved multiple persons. And I consider these kinds of offenses, they're property offenses, they're most serious and I do note they resulted, it's resulted not only in a forfeiture but it will result in the payment of restitution. So, Mr. May

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will be under considerable financial obligation for guite a bit of time. I also have to consider as another factor the history and characteristics of the defendant. I note that Mr. May is 31 years of age. Obviously, he has tremendous family support. It's - I listened very carefully to what his mother, Susan Stanton, has said. She was very candid with the Court. I read the other letters submitted and I note the presence of his stepfather, David, David Stanton, in court and his brother, Alex May, and his friends, Andrew Puddington and Jacob Taballa. Mr. May has to make a decision. Does he want to be with those people sitting around the dining room table at, at home or does he want to visit with them at a federal correction institution in the visiting room? think I know the answer to that question. But it's got to, it's got to come from within, within him. But he has tremendous support and, and the fact that he has this support is something that points to the fact that he may not commit like crimes in the future. He did provide what I consider to be a significant amount of cooperation with the Government. He did the right thing, at least to the extent that he did cooperate. They brought somebody to justice and he was providing information in other areas and, most importantly, he explained the intricacies of how this crime occurred, because this a very sophisticated

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

crime. Very few people, maybe that's overstating it, but a lot of people don't have the knowledge of computers that he did to pull off the, the kind of crimes that were engaged in this case. I do know he has a GED degree and he, he doesn't report any abuse of drugs or abuse of alcohol. He certainly, he has, what I'll, what I'll call a prior record but it's - I don't consider it to be anywhere as serious as the cri- kind of crimes he committed here, although I don't want to understate the, the seriousness of terroristic threats or damaging property and engaging in disorderly conduct, not acceptable conduct at all. But, obviously, the, the one fact which is a huge factor in this case in dealing with his history and characteristics, is his autism. And when I say autism, the psychiatrist, Dr. Weiss, has described it as autism spectrum disorder, ASD. He also notes that he has attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, A- ADHD, and depression. So, he has more than just the autism spectrum disorder but that's the disorder that's been focused on in the courtroom today and essentially in the report. And there is something in the nature of this disorder that could influence a person to engage in the kind of conduct that Mr. May engaged in in this courtroom. I don't want to go into all the details. It's been said many times by different persons on this record already

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

today but there is a concern that this is not a disorder that just goes away because somebody is incarcerated or placed on supervised release. And I do have some concern about the future activity but I have the assurance of his mother and even Mr. May, from what Mr. May said and I listened very carefully to what he said, that all steps will be taken to deal with this disorder and prevent him from engaging in the kind of conduct he engaged in in this case in the future. But Mr. May has a good deal in his favor in terms of his history and characteristics. I don't look upon - I do agree with Mr. Lowe that we can't let a disorder be a blank- blanket excuse for committing offenses but we can take it into account as a, as a factor that might cause a person to engage in behavior that's just not acceptable in society. There are other factors that a Court has to consider in determining what's an appropriate sentence and these factors I'm to consider in imposing a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary, to take them into account. consider the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense and I've already discussed It's been discussed on this record by others. have to consider the fact that, that the sentence has to promote respect for the law. When Mr. May was engaging in the kind of conduct he did, obviously, he was not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respecting the law. When you don't respect the law, you may end up being a defendant in a criminal case, putting yourself at the mercy of a federal judge and respecting the law is a big factor here. Also, the need to afford deterrence is a big factor in sentencing. Deterrence comes in two forms, a general deterrence, a sentence has to convince others that they should not commit crimes like this and it also has to deter Mr. May from committing future crimes. I'm hoping he gets it with the sentence I will impose and given the time he's already served. I'm hearing from his mother and perhaps Mr., Mr. May I can draw the conclusion that he gets the need to be deterred from committing like crimes in the future. I also have to consider the need to protect the public from further crimes by Mr. May and the sentence will take this into account. Obviously, there will be a sentence of incarceration. That's part of the sen- that would be imposed. Also, there'll be an extensive period of supervised release so he will be under the jurisdiction of the Court for a considerable period of time. commits future crimes, he may be back and I'm sure that's not what his family wants nor does he want. But society has to be protected from further crimes of this nature. I will make part of the sentence a, the fact that he's not to use a computer unless it has the monitoring equipment

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

attached that the U.S. Probation Office monitor, uses in monitor, in order to monitor persons who commit crimes with computers. I have to consider the need to provide him with education or vocational training and other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. will recommend to the United States Bureau of Prisons that he get mental health counseling. I think that's an important component of the sentence and also while he's on supervised release. I have to consider the kinds of sentences available. Obviously, anything short of incarceration would not be warranted here and a sentence, a sentence of incarceration is warranted and I've considered other kinds of sentences but there has to be incarceration and supervised release considering all of the factors. I've considered the ranges recommended in the sentencing guidelines and any pertinent policy statements issue by the sentencing commission pursuant to law and I can't think of any that are applicable here and I've already discussed the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found quilty of similar conduct. And the last factor I have to consider is the need to provide victims with restitution and restitution will be ordered in this case. Having considered all these factors and all the written submissions that have been made by the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

parties, the arguments of counsel, Mrs. Stanton's testimony and Mr. May's statement to the Court, and the presence of so many on his behalf, I'm prepared to impose the, the following sentence and Mr. May does get credit for time served already. But that is calculated by the United States Bureau of Prisons, not by, not by the Court. Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Justin David May, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 92 months. term is comprised of a term of 56 months on each of counts 1 through 20 and 31 through 45 of docket number 18-20, 26, such terms to run concurrently and a term of 36 months in each of counts 1 through 22 of docket number 19-417, such terms to be served concurrently to each other but consecutive to the terms imposed on counts 1 through 20 and 31 through 30-45 of docket number 26 - 18 USC 26 to produce a total term of 92 months. Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years on each of counts 1 through 20 of docket number 18-26 and a term of three years on each of counts 31 through 45 of docket number 18-26 and counts 1 through 22 of docket number 19-417, such terms to be served concurrently. Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district in which the defendant is released. on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, shall be prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous device, shall not possess an illegal controlled substance and shall comply with the other standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court. The defendant must submit to one drug test within 15 days of commencement of supervised release and at least two tests thereafter as determined by the probation officer. The defendant shall submit to the collection of a DNA sample at the direction of the United States Probation Office pursuant to Section 3 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 of 42 USC Section 14135(a). And again, the, the reason for the variance is the agreement of the parties that there should be a variance and certainly his autism and how it's been described on this record as affecting him in the offense. In addition, the defendant shall comply with the following special conditions. The defendant shall participate in a mental health program evaluation with the focus on anger management and/or treatment and abide by the rules of any such program until satisfactorily discharged. I'm going to make the same recommendation to the United States Bureau of Prisons. The defendant is to cooperate with the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Internal Revenue Service by filing all delinquent or amended returns and by timely filing all future returns that come due during the period of supervised release. The defendant is to properly report all correct taxable income and claim only allowable expenses on those returns. The defendant is to provide all appropriate documentation in support of said returns. Upon request, the defendant is to furnish the Internal Revenue Service with information pertaining to all assets and liabilities and the defendant is to fully cooperate by paying all taxes, interest and penalties due and otherwise comply with the tax laws of the United States. The defendant shall provide the U.S. Probation Office with full disclosure of his financial records to include yearly income tax returns upon the request of the U.S. Probation Office. defendant shall cooperate with the probation officer in the investigation of his financial dealings and shall provide truthful monthly statements of his income. defendant is prohibited from incurring any new credit card charges, any new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of the U.S. Probation - of the probation officer unless the defendant is compliance with a payment schedule for any fine, well not fine, or any restitution obligation. The defendant shall not incumber or liquidate interest in any assets unless it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is in direct service of the restitution obligation or otherwise has the expressed approval of the Court. As a further special condition of supervised release, the defendant is to refrain from self-employment similar to that described in the incident offense and also I will require that any, any computer or computer device, be it a PC or laptop, a Smartphone, any kind of computer device that he has access to be monitored by equipment installed by the United States Probation Office. And I will make sure we, we cover this as an appropriate condition of, of the, of the sentence. I -- with respect to the, the last two conditions I just imposed, I find that there is a reasonably direct relationship existing between the defendant's, what I'll call occupation, business or profession as reflected in this case in the conduct relevant to the offense of conviction. An imposition of such a restriction is reasonably necessary to protect the public because there is reason to believe that absent the restriction the defendant will continue to engage in unlawful conduct similar to that for which the defendant was convicted and I also find that the timeframe of the supervised release and the structure of the special condition is for the minimum timeframe and to the minimum extent necessary to protect the public. And with respect to -- this is with respect to the defendant refraining

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from self-employment similar to that described in the incident offense and because he used computers the way he did in order to carry out this offense. I also find that there's a direct relationship between the condition requiring monitoring of the computers and his offense of conviction and that this kind of condition is necessary to protect the public also. And I, I do have a concern defendant will continue to engage in unlawful conduct similar to that for which he was convicted and, again, the timeframe for this restriction while he's on supervised release is the minimum timeframe and to the minimum extent necessary to protect the public. It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay restitution in the amount of \$4,021,225.00. The Court will waive the interest requirement in this case. The rest- the payment should be made payable to the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for proportionate distribution to the Cisco Systems, Inc. in care of Erica Brand Portnoy (ph), Sideman & Bankrupt-Bancroft, LLP, 1 Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, CA 94111 in the amount of \$3,449,567.00, to Microsoft Fraud Investigation Strike Team, attention of Investigator Jack Williams (ph), 1 Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052 in the amount of \$364,761.00, to the IRS in care of IRS-RACS, R-A-C-S, attention Mail Stop 6261 Restitution, 333 W. Pershing Avenue, Kansas City, MO 64101 in the amount of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\$52,497.00, to Lovana- Len- Lenevo- Lenovo, attention David Strong (ph), Lenovo Treasury Director, 8001 Development Drive, Morrisville, NC 27560 in the amount of \$143,000.00 and to APC, attention Michael J. McCarthy (ph), legal counsel, Schneider Electric, 132 Fairground Road, West Kingston, Rhode Island 02892 in the amount of \$11,400.00. The restitution is due immediately. recommended that the defendant participate in the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Financial Responsibility Program and provide a minimum payment of \$25.00 per quarter to his restitution. In the event the entire amount is not paid prior to the commencement of supervision, the defendant shall satisfy the amount due in monthly installments of not less than \$200.00 to commence 30 days after release from confinement. And I have looked carefully at the finances that Mr. May has as reflected in the Presentence Report and I'm ordering that kind of restitution consistent with what I see in the Presentence Report as to The defendant shall notify the United his finances. States Attorney for this District within 30 days of any change of mailing address or residence that occurs while any portion of the restitution remains unpaid. The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine. The Court will waive the fine in this case. It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay to the

United States a total special assessment of \$5,700.00 which shall be due immediately. This is the sentence of the Court. Is there any question about the sentence?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: No, Your Honor.

MR. LOWE: Your Honor, I would ask, however, that the judgment and commitment order also reflect the two forfeiture orders that were entered.

THE COURT: That'll be done.

MR. LOWE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm just wondering if you want me to recommend that he be incarcerated at an institution of the Bureau of Prisons as close to the Philadelphia area as possible?

MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright. We'll, we'll make that recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons and, Mr. May, you have a right to appeal the, the sentence that's just been imposed. You have 14 days to file the Notice of Appeal either from today or when the judgment is entered in your case. The judgment is the sentence I just pronounced orally reduced to writing and it's filed with the clerk of the court. And if you can't afford, afford to pay the filing fee to take the Notice of Appeal, please notify the clerk of the court and the clerk of the court will file the Notice of Appeal on your behalf. I did notice that he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had a plea agreement in the first case, the 19-417 with an appellant waiver provision in it. Obviously, the second case was an open plea. I'm not sure how that would affect his rights on appeal. But I have no say in what you do, whether you take an appeal. That's strictly between you and your, your lawyer, Mr. May, so speak to Ms. Taylor-Smith and consult with her about whether you want to take an appeal but there is an appellant waiver provision in effect, at least in the 19-417 when Mr. May gave up certain rights on appeal. Anything further anyone wants to put on the record? MR. LOWE: Your Honor, the Government -- I submitted to Mr. Higgins (ph) a --THE COURT: Your motion to dismiss? MR. LOWE: -- motion to dismiss, yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Yeah. MR. LOWE: The, specifically, just so everyone knows, the counts that I had agreed to dismiss, which I believe was counts 21 through 30 of the first case. THE COURT: Alright. Can you submit a, a written order? MR. LOWE: I did, Your Honor. That was attached to what I sent to Mr. Higgins. I can, I can send it over again.

THE COURT: Alright. I will tell Mr. Higgins to

```
- I will sign it and I'll tell Mr. Higgins to file the
 1
 2
     record.
              MR. LOWE: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay?
 4
 5
              MR. LOWE: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: And we'll, we'll get that done.
7
     Alright. I don't think there's anything else to be done
8
     now. Anything else anybody wants put on the record?
 9
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Nothing from the defense, Your
10
     Honor.
11
              MR. LOWE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
12
              THE COURT: We'll stand in recess.
13
              MS. TAYLOR-SMITH: Thank you.
14
              ESR/CLERK FOLLMER: All rise.
```

(Court adjourned at 12:12 p.m.)

15

CERTIFICATE

I, Stephanie Garcia, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

July 8, 2021